

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 5-6, 9-14, 24-25, 28-37, 39, and 45-52 have been canceled. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 15-23, 26-27, 38, and 40-44 are pending, of which claims 1-4, 7, 15-17, 20-23, 26, 38, and 40-43 have been amended.

**35 U.S.C. §112 Claim Rejections**

Claims 2-8, 10-14, 16-19, 21-26, 29, 31, 33-36, 39-43, and 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office indicates that the term "A method" (for example) in each of the rejected claims lacks antecedent basis (*Office Action* p.2).

Applicant respectfully submits that the subject of each of these dependent claims is to be independently evaluated as a claimed invention and there is no requirement that a dependent claim refer to a previous claim beginning with "The" rather than "A". Although a dependent claim refers back to a base claim to provide a base definition of the subject, the subject of a dependent claim is itself separate and new. A dependent claim that begins with "A" clearly meets the requirement of "referring back to and further limiting another claim or claims in the same application" (37 C.F.R. §1.75(c); MPEP 608.01(i) and 608.01(n)). Further, MPEP §608.01(n)I.A. sets forth several examples of dependent claims that begin with "A" referring back to another claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejection be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,474 to Fuh et al. (hereinafter, "Fuh"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,415 to Hendren, III (hereinafter, "Hendren") (*Office Action* p.3). Claims 5-6, 9-13, 24-25, 28-37, 39, and 45-52 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 15-23, 26-27, 38, and 40-44.

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Fuh in view Hendren, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,940,594 to Ali et al. (hereinafter, "Ali") (*Office Action* p.10). Claim 14 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 8.

**Claim 1** recites a network system comprising:

a network server configured to maintain network access information corresponding to users authorized to access the network system;

a domain controller remotely located from the network server at a remote network site and communicatively linked with the network server, the domain controller configured to locally administrate access to the network system;

the domain controller further configured to:

track individual users that request access to the network system via the domain controller at the remote network site;

receive a first network access request from a user and validate the first network access request with the network access information maintained at the network server;

cache the network access information; and

receive a second network access request from the user and validate the second network access request with the network access information cached at the domain controller.

1 Fuh and/or Hendren do not teach or suggest a domain controller that  
2 receives and validates a first network access request from a user with the network  
3 access information maintained at the network server, cache the network access  
4 information, and then receive and validate a second network access request from  
5 the user with the network access information cached at the domain controller, as  
6 recited in claim 1.

7 Fuh describes that when a client submits an HTTP packet, the  
8 authentication proxy denies the HTTP packet if the source IP address of the packet  
9 does not match and the authentication proxy makes no attempt at authentication  
10 (*Fuh* col.11, lines 28-32). Fuh further describes that a new authentication cache  
11 can then be created from which the authentication proxy can authenticate the client  
12 (*Fuh* col.11, lines 49-55). Fuh does not authenticate a client unless the  
13 authentication proxy has an authentication cache from which to authenticate the  
14 client.

15 Contrary to Fuh, Applicant claims that the domain controller (which is  
16 remote from the network server) validates a network access request with the  
17 network access information maintained at the network server if the domain  
18 controller does not have the network access information cached. Hendren also  
19 does not teach the features recited in claim 1, nor has the Office cited Hendren for  
20 disclosing these features of claim 1. Hendren merely describes a cache for  
21 resources, such as Web pages, and does not provide any discussion of network  
22 access validation or authentication.  
23  
24  
25

1 Accordingly, independent claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-4 and 7  
2 are allowable over the Fuh-Hendren combination for at least the reasons described  
3 above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

4  
5 Claim 8 is dependent upon claim 1, and is allowable over the Fuh-Hendren-  
6 Ali combination by virtue of claim 1 being allowable as described above. Ali also  
7 does not teach the features recited in claim 1, nor has the Office cited Ali for  
8 disclosing the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is allowable and  
9 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

10  
11 Claim 15 recites a network comprising a remote server configured to:

12 receive a first network access request from a user and validate the  
13 first network access request with the network information maintained at the  
14 global information server;  
15 cache the network information;  
16 receive a second network access request from the user and validate  
17 the second network access request with the network information cached at  
18 the remote server;

19 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Fuh and/or  
20 Hendren do not teach or suggest a domain controller that receives and validates a  
21 first network access request from a user with the network information maintained  
22 at the global information server, cache the network information, and then receive  
23 and validate a second network access request from the user with the network  
24 information cached at the remote server, as recited in claim 15.

25 Fuh does not authenticate a client unless the authentication proxy has an  
authentication cache from which to authenticate the client. Further, Hendren does

not provide any discussion of network access validation or authentication. Accordingly, independent claim 15 along with dependent claims 16-19 are allowable over the Fuh-Hendren combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites a method comprising:

validating a first network access request from a user at a second network site with the network access information maintained at the first network site;  
caching the network access information at the second network site;  
validating a second network access request from the user at the second network site with the network access information cached at the second network site;

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Fuh and/or Hendren do not teach or suggest a validating a first network access request from a user at a second network site with the network access information maintained at the first network site, caching the network access information at the second network site, and then validating a second network access request from the user at the second network site with the network access information cached at the second network site, as recited in claim 20.

Fuh does not authenticate a client unless the authentication proxy has an authentication cache from which to authenticate the client. Further, Hendren does not provide any discussion of network access validation or authentication. Accordingly, independent claim 20 along with dependent claims 21-23 and 26-27 are allowable over the Fuh-Hendren combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

1 Claim 38 recites

2 validating the first network access request at the remote server with  
3 the network information maintained at the global information server;  
4 caching the network information at the remote server;  
5 validating the second network access request at the remote server  
6 with the network information cached at the remote server;

7 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Fuh and/or  
8 Hendren do not teach or suggest a validating a first network access request (from a  
9 user) at the remote server with the network information maintained at the global  
10 information server, caching the network information at the remote server, and then  
11 validating the second network access request (from the user) at the remote server  
12 with the network information cached at the remote server, as recited in claim 38.

13 Fuh does not authenticate a client unless the authentication proxy has an  
14 authentication cache from which to authenticate the client. Further, Hendren does  
15 not provide any discussion of network access validation or authentication.  
16 Accordingly, independent claim 38 along with dependent claims 40-44 are  
17 allowable over the Fuh-Hendren combination and Applicant respectfully requests  
18 that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**Conclusion**

Pending claims 1-4, 7-8, 15-23, 26-27, 38, and 40-44 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Sep 29, 2004

By: David A. Morasch  
David A. Morasch  
Reg. No. 42,905  
(509) 324-9256 x 210